

REMARKS

The present application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 11, 2008. Claims 1-22, 28, 29, and 32-35 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21 are in independent form. New Claim 35 has been added to provide Applicant with a more complete scope of protection. Claims 1, 2, 9, 13, 19, and 21 have been amended hereby to define aspects of Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable consideration is requested.

The Office Action objected to the specification as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Although Applicant believes that the specification clearly provides antecedent basis for the subject matter of Claims 1-11, 28, 29, 32, and 33, Applicant has amended the specification, at the paragraph spanning lines 4-8 of page 25, to mimic the language of these claims. The changes add no new matter to the original disclosure. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to the specification is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objected to Claim 2 because the preamble thereof recites "compuer" instead of "computer." The preamble of Claim 2 has been amended hereby to recite "computer." Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to Claim 2 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over a document entitled "Web Services Description Language (WSDL) V1.2" (*Chinnici et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0051216 (*Hsu et al.*), and further in view of a document entitled "An Overview of the MPEG-7 Description Definition Language (DDL) Proposals" (*Hunter et al.*); that Claims 12, 19, 20, and 29 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chinnici et al.* and *Hsu et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028559 (*Moreau*) and U.S. Patent Application

Publication No. 2004/0117798 (*Newman et al.*); that Claims 13, 21, 22, and 28 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreau* and *Hsu et al.*, in view of *Chinnici et al.*; that Claims 14-18 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Moreau*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Chinnici et al.* in view of *Hunter et al.*; and that Claims 32-34 are rejected under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0205573 (*Carlson et al.*). Applicant submits that independent Claims 1, 12, 13, 19, and 21, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is directed to a computer-readable storage medium storing control logic for causing a computer to implement a method of offering a service, described in a service description document, in a communication network. The method includes: (1) extracting, from the service description document, a first abstract part adapted to describe at least one message exchanged over the communication network when the service is implemented, wherein the first abstract part includes a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document; (2) extracting, from the service description document, a second concrete part adapted to describe information relating to transmission of the messages over the communication network; (3) extracting a content description depending on the abstract constraints associated with the multimedia document; (4) comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document; and (5) transmitting an error message, if the content description does not satisfy the abstract constraints.

Notable features of Claim 1 are that a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document is extracted from a service description document, a content description depending on the abstract constraints associated with the multimedia document is extracted, the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document are compared, and an error message is transmitted if the content description does not satisfy the abstract constraints. By virtue of these features, a tool can be provided that takes a binary multimedia document and an MPEG-7 document as inputs, and validates the multimedia document based on abstract constraints included in the MPEG-7 document, for example.¹

Chinnici et al. relates to a model for describing web services. Apparently, *Chinnici et al.* teaches that, when an Extensible Markup Language (XML) Schema is used, a symbol space may exist for key constraints (see paragraph 32, section 2.13). *Chinnici et al.* discusses that a Web Services Description Language (WSDL) may be used with other description languages to describe message parts and their constraints (see paragraph 36, section 3.2). As best understood by Applicant, XML Schema and other conventional description languages may be used to validate *concrete* constraints on XML documents, which are not binary multimedia documents. Accordingly, *Chinnici et al.* fails to disclose or suggest that *abstract* constraints are associated with a *binary* multimedia document, much less that *abstract* constraints associated with a *binary* multimedia document are extracted from a service description document.

Hsu et al. relates to a system for automatic validation of multimedia product

¹/ The example(s) presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes only. Any details presented in the illustrative example(s) should not be construed to limit the scope of the claims.

manuals. Apparently, *Hsu et al.* teaches that a Product Document Constraint Specification Language (PDCSL) is provided to represent various types of documentation guidelines as document constraints that are enforced within documents (see paragraph 5). Each document constraint identifies a set of document objects, and specifies a logical expression that is to be evaluated for each instance of the document objects (see paragraph 5). A Document Constraint Analyzer takes as input a set of document files and a document constraint specification file, extracts and examines information associated with the document objects, and evaluates the logical expressions specified in the document constraints (see paragraph 5). As best understood by Applicant, the Document Constraint Analyzer would produce Base64 representations of the documents, not binary data. Accordingly, *Hsu et al.* fails to disclose or suggest that *abstract* constraints are associated with a *binary* multimedia document, much less extracting a content description depending on the *abstract* constraints associated with the multimedia document, comparing the content description and the description of the *abstract* constraints extracted from the service description document, and transmitting an error message, if the content description does not satisfy the *abstract* constraints.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner's conclusion that the combination of *Chinnici et al.* and *Hsu et al.* fails to disclose that the document is a *binary* multimedia document (page 6 of the Office Action). The Office Action, however, asserts that *binary* multimedia documents are disclosed in *Hunter et al.* According to Applicant's understanding, *Hunter et al.* relates to proposals for an MPEG-7 document Description Definition Language (DDL). Apparently, *Hunter et al.* teaches that an MPEG-7 DDL should provide a mechanism to relate descriptors to data of multiple media types, including audio, video, audio-visual presentations, interfaces to

textual descriptions, and combinations thereof (see page 2). As best understood by Applicant, a descriptor of binary data included in a multimedia document does not teach or suggest an *abstract* constraint associated with a *binary* multimedia document. Accordingly, *Hunter et al.* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chinnici et al.* and *Hsu et al.* discussed above.

Applicant submits that a combination of *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.*, assuming such combination would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest a method of offering a service described in a service description document, in which the method includes “extracting, from the service description document, a first abstract part adapted to describe at least one message exchanged over the communication network when the service is implemented, wherein the first abstract part includes a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document,” and “extracting a content description depending on the abstract constraints associated with the multimedia document,” and “comparing the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document” and “transmitting an error message, if the content description does not satisfy the abstract constraints,” as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is patentable over *Chinnici et al.*, *Hsu et al.*, and *Hunter et al.*, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Independent Claims 12, 13, 19, and 21 include features similar to those of Claim 1, in which a description of abstract constraints associated with a binary multimedia document is extracted from a service description document, a content description depending on the abstract constraints associated with the multimedia document is extracted, and the content description and the description of the abstract constraints extracted from the service description document are

compared. Therefore, Claims 12, 13, 19, and 21 also are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. The other rejected claims in the present application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above, and therefore are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable consideration and an early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lock See Yu-Jahnes/
Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2621180v2